



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/009,982 01/27/93 SOKOLOV

EXAMINER  
CHURCH, C

ILYA ZBOROVSKY  
6 SCHOOLHOUSE WAY  
DIX HILLS, NY 11746

25M1/0715

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2506

8

DATE MAILED:

07/15/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 4/4/94 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.                   |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.                 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input type="checkbox"/>  |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 19-28 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☒ Claims 1-18 have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 19-28 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received  
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. ; filed on
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Claims 20, 21 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limiting meaning of "lining" in claim 20 is unclear and seems to contradict conventional meaning of the term. Claim 26 is incomplete as it fails to recite any x-ray absorbing material. The symbols "tg" and " $\alpha$ " in claims 24 and 26 are undefined.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide support in the original disclosure for the invention as it is now claimed. While the angles added to page 7 of the specification and to claims 24 and 26 are assumed to be Mattson angles, there is no teaching that they are. This objection may be overcome by the filing of an English language text book describing the cited angles as Mattson angles. Further, there is no teaching in the original disclosure that the radiation absorbing layer is one piece.

Claims 21, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112,

first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --  
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Albert. See lines 13-51 of column 3 and lines 32 of column 14 to 51 of column 15. While Albert does not explicitly state that the sides of the throughholes are plated, he does

Serial No. 009,982  
Art Unit 2506

-4-

explain that common printed circuit board plating techniques are employed, and it is inherent that such techniques plate through the holes. Alternatively It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to plate the sides of the holes as the grid would not effectively reduce x-ray scatter otherwise.

Claims 22, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Albert in view of Millenaar. Albert fails to teach the use of cover plates on the end faces of his grid, but this is a common practice as shown by Millenaar, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Albert grid with such covers to protect it. Furthermore the use of evacuated holes would have been obvious to reduce x-ray absorption.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER

Serial No. 009,982  
Art Unit 2506

-5-

THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (703) 308-4861.

*Craig E Church*

CRAIG E. CHURCH  
Senior Examiner  
ART UNIT 2506